

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated July 7, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 8-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Pal et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,219,675. The Examiner also objected to the specification and rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, alleging that the disclosure does not support claim 25.

Applicants begin by noting that claims 8-24 and 26-39 are currently pending. When originally filed, the present application included claims 1-39 copied from parent application serial no. 09/044,931, now U.S. Patent No. 6,185,611. In the transmittal letter accompanying the present application, Applicants cancelled claims 2-7. In a Preliminary Amendment filed January 8, 2003, Applicants cancelled claim 1 and listed claims 8-39. Finally, by this Amendment, Applicants have cancelled claim 25, leaving claims 8-24 and 26-39 pending.

Information Disclosure Statements

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on October 21, 2002, could not be located. However, the Examiner returned the fully-initialed 1449 form indicating that he has considered all of the references filed in the October 21, 2002, Statement. Therefore, Applicants believe that the Examiner meant to state that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 12, 2002, could not be located because the 1449 form submitted with the June 12, 2002, Statement has not been returned. Therefore, later this week, Applicants will submit an additional copy of the Information Disclosure Statement and references originally filed on June 12, 2002, for the Examiner's consideration.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Furthermore, Applicants note that only page 1 of 2 of the 1449 submitted with the November 8, 2001, Information Disclosure Statement was initialed and returned by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner return the initialed page 2 of 2 from the November 8, 2001, Statement to indicate that all of the references have been considered.

Section 112 Rejections

Regarding the section 112 objection to the specification and rejection of claim 25, Applicants maintain that claim 25 as filed was fully supported and enabled by the specification. However, Applicants have cancelled claim 25.

Section 103(a) Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Pal et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,219,675. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Pal et al. discloses a database management system with a centrally maintained master database. (Pal et al., col. 5, ll. 5-8.) Distributed clients store copies of portions of the database, i.e., database objects, locally. A database object is "a unit of data in the database such as one or more fields of a record, one or more records, or one or more tables." (Id., col. 4, ll. 37-46.) A navigation agent manages the database objects that are distributed to multiple clients. (Id., col. 1, ll. 10-21.) When the central database needs to update a database object, it directs all of the clients that have copies of the affected object to halt processing and discard their copies of the outdated objects. (Id., col. 5, ll. 28-37.)

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

All of the claims recite a lookup service. Specifically, claims 8-21 and 26-39 recite "a lookup service with associated services," and claims 22-24 recite "a lookup service having indications of services that are available for use." In the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that the "lookup service as referred [to] in the claims is an obvious variation of the database because databases are used for lookup services or for query services." As an example, the Examiner cites query-based searches for phone numbers or ZIP codes. (7/7/03 Office Action, p. 4.) However, the term "lookup service" must be interpreted in light of the definition provided in the specification. M.P.E.P. § 2111.01 (8th ed., revised Feb. 2003). Indeed Applicants provided a section of the specification entitled "The Lookup Service Definition," explaining that a lookup service is a central registry of service items representing services available within, for example, a Djinn. (Specification, p. 12, l. 19 - p. 13, l. 9). Using this definition of the claim term "lookup service," it becomes clear that the claimed lookup service is not merely an obvious variation of a database, as alleged by the Examiner.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show some suggestion or motivation in the reference or in the general knowledge of those skilled in the art to modify the reference. Even if the claimed lookup service is a modification of a database, the Examiner has shown no suggestion or motivation to modify the database management system of Pal et al. to produce a lookup service with associated services, as recited in all of the pending claims and defined in the specification. Therefore, Applicants request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejections of claims 8-24 and 26-39.

Claims 12-21, 23-24, and 30-39 recite a "request to be notified when the lookup service is updated." This enables a client to receive notifications whenever the lookup service is updated, such as when a new service is associated with the lookup service (e.g., claim 16) or disassociated with the lookup service (e.g., claim 17). In the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that "Applicant is broadly claiming that when a lookup service is updated, the requesting client should be notified but this is exactly an obvious variation of Pal et al. teaching of the callback message requesting a response when the client completed processing." (7/7/03 Office Action, p. 4.) However, the reference expressly teaches that the callback message is not responsive to an update of the database.

In Pal et al., a callback request is sent from the navigation agent to a client to warn the client to stop using a database object that will soon be obsolete. The callback requests the client to respond when it has stopped using a database object. Once all of the affected clients have responded, the navigation agent permits the database object to be updated. This is unrelated to receiving a request to be notified when a lookup service is updated, as recited in claims 12-21, 23-24, and 30-39. In fact, the callback request of Pal et al. is expressly not sent to the client that will be updating the central database: "[t]he navigational agent 208 then sends a callback message to each of these clients *other than the client requesting the writelock* (Pal et al., col. 6, ll. 63-65.) Therefore, the Pal et al. callback request could not suggest a client's request to be notified when a lookup service is updated. Because the reference fails to suggest the

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

modification alleged by the Examiner, Applicants request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejections of claims 12-21, 23-24, and 30-39.

Several of the dependent claims contain recitations not disclosed or suggested by Pal et al., such as "associating a new service with the lookup service" (claims 9, 16, 27, and 34), "disassociating one of the associated services from the lookup service" (claims 10, 17, 28, and 25), and "modifying the attributes of one of the associated services" (claims 11, 18, 29, and 36). Pal et al. teaches a database management system that does not relate to adding, removing, or modifying services associated with a lookup service. Indeed, the Examiner did not allege any suggestion or teaching of these claim elements in the Office Action. Therefore, Applicants request the withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejections of claims 9-11, 16-18, 27-29, and 34-36.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 06502.0110-01

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

By:

Jeffrey A. Berkowitz
Reg. No. 36,743

Dated: October 7, 2003

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com